

## Restorative justice conferencing

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2015. Literature review updated October 2015.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [technical documentation](#).

Program Description: Restorative Justice Conferences are face-to-face meetings typically with the victim and the offender and a professionally trained mediator. Conferences may also include other supporting persons or community members to resolve the harm done by the offender. Conferences can take place during incarceration, before sentencing, but after a guilty plea, as a diversion program, or during re-entry.

### Benefit-Cost Summary

Program benefits		Summary statistics	
Participants	\$704	Benefit to cost ratio	\$4.00
Taxpayers	\$1,346	Benefits minus costs	\$3,236
Other (1)	\$2,103	Probability of a positive net present value	71 %
Other (2)	\$162		
Total	\$4,315		
Costs	(\$1,078)		
Benefits minus cost	\$3,236		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2014). The economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [technical documentation](#).

### Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates

Source of benefits	Benefits to				Total benefits
	Participants	Taxpayers	Other (1)	Other (2)	
From primary participant					
Crime	\$0	\$950	\$1,836	\$479	\$3,265
Labor market earnings (hs grad)	\$728	\$310	\$359	\$180	\$1,577
Health care (educational attainment)	(\$23)	\$85	(\$94)	\$43	\$11
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$1	(\$540)	(\$539)
Totals	\$704	\$1,346	\$2,103	\$162	\$4,315

We created the two "other" categories to report results that do not fit neatly in the "participant" or "taxpayer" perspectives. In the "Other (1)" category we include the benefits of reductions in crime victimization, the economic spillover benefits of improvement in human capital outcomes, and the benefits from private or employer-paid health insurance. In the "Other (2)" category we include estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.

## Detailed Cost Estimates

	Annual cost	Program duration	Year dollars	Summary statistics	
Program costs	\$1,078	1	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2014 dollars)	(\$1,078)
Comparison costs	\$0	1	2014	Uncertainty (+ or - %)	10 %

Dispute Resolution Center of Thurston County: 2013 Annual Report. Olympia, WA.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta analysis. The uncertainty range is used in Monte Carlo risk analysis, described in our [technical documentation](#).

### Cumulative Net Cash Flows Over Time (Non-Discounted Dollars)



## Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)		Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis					
						First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated		
				ES	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Crime	Primary	7	324	-0.107	0.402	-0.107	0.128	19	-0.107	0.128	29

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Dignan, J., Edwards, L., Hibbert, J., . . . Sorsby, A. (2008). *Does restorative justice affect reconviction: The fourth report from the evaluation of three schemes* (Ministry of Justice Research Series). Sheffield, United Kingdom: University of Sheffield, Centre for Criminological Research.

Sherman, L.W., Strang, H., & Woods, D.J. (2000). *Recidivism patterns in the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE)*. Canberra, Australia: Centre for Restorative Justice, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

For further information, contact:  
(360) 586-2677, [Institute@wsipp.wa.gov](mailto:Institute@wsipp.wa.gov)

Printed on 01-08-2016



## Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.